

Message

From: Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]
Sent: 6/20/2018 4:50:30 PM
To: Herrera, Angeles [Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov]
CC: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Subject: Responses to HQ questions FW: Tetra-Tech EC/Hunter's Point, The "Plan"
Attachments: 5_31_18_Background_HuntersPoint_TetraTechEC_SamplingIssue.docx; Tetra Tech Plan V2.0.docx

Angeles, Lily prepared the following answers to Bob's questions. Brianna has reviewed. Please review and forward, or I can if you like.

John

1. Question: Need to identify the dates when the fraudulent data were generated.

Answer: The earliest trench soil testing that the Navy evaluated were in 2006. EPA's review of the 2006 results found signs of poor data quality and failure to follow the workplan (e.g. missing gamma static scans for many survey units and many negative results from onsite lab analysis of soil). These were not necessarily signs of deliberate falsification, but many data were not reliable enough to show the Navy had met ROD requirements. 2006 was the earliest that former workers alleged in the 2017 NRC petition that they alleged practices that could have missed contamination, i.e. to avoid setting off alarms, Tetra Tech EC ran a conveyor belt for gamma scanning too quickly and set the alarm for the portal monitor for outgoing trucks too high. 2008 was the earliest in the petition that former workers alleged deliberate falsification (e.g. swapping samples or copying data electronically). Region 9 also began to see more signs of potential deliberate falsification (v.s data quality problems) in data reviews closer to 2008.

2. Question: Did EC do chemical sampling along with the rad? Did R9 or Navy look at chemical sampling results already at HP and were there any data quality concerns?

Answer: Tetra Tech EC Inc. did chemical sampling to determine disposition of excavated soil from the trench units if it was located in an Installation Restoration (IR) site. The Navy and R9 did not do an evaluation similar to that done for radiological data because the chemical data were not used to make decisions about the completeness of the cleanup.

From: Manzanilla, Enrique
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2018 2:26 PM
To: Herrera, Angeles <Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>
Cc: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>; Maldonado, Lewis <Maldonado.Lewis@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>; Lyons, John <Lyons.John@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Tetra-Tech EC/Hunter's Point, The "Plan"

Angeles and John:

Please provide Bob the answers to his questions below.

Thank you

Enrique

From: Jennings, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2018 2:21 PM
To: Manzanilla, Enrique <Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov>; Lyons, John <Lyons.John@epa.gov>
Cc: Woolford, James <Woolford.James@epa.gov>; Stalcup, Dana <Stalcup.Dana@epa.gov>; Lowery, Brigid <Lowery.Brigid@epa.gov>; Fitz-James, Schatzi <Fitz-James.Schatzi@epa.gov>; Barr, Pamela <Barr.Pamela@epa.gov>; Leonard, Paul <leonard.paul@epa.gov>; Gervais, Gregory <Gervais.Gregory@epa.gov>
Subject: Tetra-Tech EC/Hunter's Point, The "Plan"

INTERNAL DELIBERATIVE – DISCUSSION DRAFT

Enrique/John:

We're finalizing an initial plan to address the Tetra-Tech matter that I wanted to share with you for comment and also because I received some questions within HQ that I cannot answer. Below my signature line is the overall approach that is supported by the two word documents attached to this e-mail. May I get your feedback and can you also help with the following questions:

- Need to identify the dates when the fraudulent data were generated. R9 can provide that. It's important for the scoping of the effort in The "Plan".
- Did EC do chemical sampling along with the rad? Did R9 or Navy look at chemical sampling results already at HP and were there any data quality concerns?

Thanks,
Bob

Bob Jennings
Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation
703.603.8723 (desk)
571.289.0054 (cell)

From: Jennings, Robert
Sent: Friday, June 08, 2018 11:03 AM
To: Woolford, James <Woolford.James@epa.gov>; Stalcup, Dana <Stalcup.Dana@epa.gov>; Leonard, Paul <leonard.paul@epa.gov>; Gervais, Gregory <Gervais.Gregory@epa.gov>; Lowery, Brigid <Lowery.Brigid@epa.gov>; Fitz-James, Schatzi <Fitz-James.Schatzi@epa.gov>; Hovis, Jennifer <Hovis.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Barr, Pamela <Barr.Pamela@epa.gov>; Charters, David <Charters.DavidW@epa.gov>
Cc: McDonough, Barbara <McDonough.Barbara@epa.gov>; Mitchell, Crystal <Mitchell.Crystal@epa.gov>; Union, Joshua <union.joshua@epa.gov>
Subject: Tetra-Tech EC/Hunter's Point, The "Plan", Take II

INTERNAL DELIBERATIVE – DISCUSSION DRAFT

All:

Taking another stab at our plan for Tetra-Tech EC/Hunter's Point that Barry asked for. As discussed there is a lot that we don't know which makes this particularly challenging. My suggestion is we propose an initial plan to be revised as we learn more vice attempting to second and third guess what might happen in the future. To keep this simple, for the initial plan, recommend we have three parts, communications, initial scope/discovery, internal communications and coordination.

Part I Communications: The paper (first attachment) we built with OLEM in coordination with R9 should suffice for now.

Part II Scope: For Super Fund Remedial work only,

- We completed initial research to better understand the size of the Tetra-Tech and Tetra-Tech EC footprint government wide and across EPA (see second attachment).
- We completed initial research to determine sites Tetra-Tech EC may have worked on (see second attachment).
- OSRTI reached shared scope with impacted regions and USACE HQ. USACE is reaching out to their districts.
- FFRRO is advising other federal agencies that may be impacted (Navy, DOE and NASA).

Part III Internal Coordination: We have an approach based on recent press inquiries and Congressionals.

- R9 is lead for all Hunter's Point Inquires.
- All questions about the contract/debarment should be referred to OARM.
- OLEM (OSRTI and FFRRO as appropriate) answer any site level questions about EPA plans for addressing any Tetra-Tech EC or Tetra Tech and our responses would be based on the paper prepared for Part I.